

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/658,947	09/09/2003	Sean C. Semple	INEX.P-003-3	3517	
32940	7590 08/08/2006		EXAMINER		
DORSEY &	DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP			NAFF, DAVID M	
	555 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1000 SUITE 1000			PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRAN	CISCO, CA 94104	1651			
			DATE MAILED: 08/08/200	DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/658,947	SEMPLE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	David M. Naff	1651
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind ad will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>5/8</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 85-91 and 93-110 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdred 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 85-91 and 93-110 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination	rawn from consideration. I/or election requirement.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a control of the second and a c	ccepted or b) objected to by the ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ot	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume * See the attached detailed Office action for a limited copies. 	ents have been received. Ents have been received in Applicationity documents have been receiveau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/8/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/658,947 Page 2

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

DETAILED ACTION

An amendment of 5/8/06 amended claims 85-91, 93-101, 105, 107 and 108, added new claims 109 and 110, and canceled claim 92.

Claims examined on the merits are 85-91 and 93-110, which are all claims in the application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 103 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Support is not found in the specification for the nucleic acidlipid particle not being substantially degraded at a temperature and time as required by claims 103 and 104. Example 10 disclosing that free phosphorothicate oligodeoxynucleotide shows significant breakdown in serum within 30 minutes is inadequate support. A time of 20 minutes is not found in the specification.

Response to Arguments

It is granted as urged by applicants that the claimed subject matter need not be described in the specification literally. However, when not described literally, the specification must provide clear support for the claimed subject matter. Example 10 disclosing that

Application/Control Number: 10/658,947

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

free phosphorothicate oligodeoxynucleotide shows significant breakdown in serum within 30 minutes, and the encapsulated nucleic acid not degrading even after 24 hours is inadequate support for selecting 30 minutes as a time less than 24 hours which degradation of the encapsulated nucleic acid does not occur. Selecting 30 minutes for degradation not occurring permits degradation after 30 minutes. This changes the original description in the specification. A time of 20 minutes is not found in the specification as a time for degradation not occurring. For the same type of reasons set forth above in regard to 30 minutes, there is no basis for selecting 20 minutes as a time degradation does not occur, and after which degradation can occur.

Page 3

Double Patenting

Claims 85-91, 93, 97-106 and 108-110 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,858,225 B2 in view of Collins and Cullis et al and Wheeler et al (WO) for reasons set forth in the previous office action of 11/7/05.

Double Patenting

Claims 94-96 and 107 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,858,225 B2 in view of the references as applied to claims 85-91, 93, 97-106 and 108-110 above, and further in view of Wheeler et al ('410) and Unger ('276).

It would have been obvious to use DODMA as the amino-lipid of the patent claims as suggested by Wheeler et al ('410) using DODMA (col

Application/Control Number: 10/658,947 Page 4

Art Unit: 1651

5

20

51, line 64) as a component of a nucleic acid-lipid particle similar to that of the patent claims. When providing a neutral lipid in the nucleic acid-lipid particle of the patent claims as set forth above, it would have been obvious to use DSPC as the neutral lipid as suggested by Unger disclosing using DSPC in preparing a lipid vesicle.

Response to Arguments

Applicants indicate that a terminal disclaimer will be filed when the claims are otherwise allowable.

Double Patenting

Claims 85-91, 93, 94, 97-106 and 108-110 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-72 of U.S. Patent No. 6,287,591 B1 in view of Collins and Cullis et al for reasons set forth in the previous office action.

15 Double Patenting

Claims 95, 96 and 107 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-72 of U.S. Patent No. 6,287,591 B1 in view of the references as applied to claims 85-91, 93, 94, 97-106 and 108-110 above, and in further view of Wheeler et al ('410) for reasons in the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

Contrary to applicants' argument, Wheeler et al does not require DODMA-AN. See claim 4, line 6, where DODMA is the cationic lipid.

Application/Control Number: 10/658,947 Page 5

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

Applicants indicate that a terminal will be filed when the claims are otherwise allowable.

Conclusion

The claims are free of the prior art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is 571-272-0920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/658,947

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David M. Naff Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651 Page 6

DMN 8/5/09

10

5